## Applicant(s) Application No. NAKAMURA, SHIGENOBU 10/648,389 Interview Summary **Art Unit** Examiner **Marcus Charles** 3682 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Marcus Charles. (4)\_\_\_\_. (2) John Fitzpatrick. Date of Interview: 06 October 2005. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c)⊠ Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_. Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Matsui et al. (5,780,731) and Adachi et al. (6,201,310). Agreement with respect to the claims f) $\boxtimes$ was reached. g) $\square$ was not reached. h) $\square$ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: an agreement was reached in that the prior art fails to disclose or render obvious the first generator being use to generate torque and reduces fluctuation in the belt tension by controlling the excitation current supplied in the field coil in the first generator. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. PRIMARY EXAMINER Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required